

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,823	10/29/2001		Eduard K. de Jong	P-6991	3414
24209	7590	02/09/2005		EXAM	INER
GUNNISO 1900 GARD		Y & HODGSON,	VAUGHN JR, WILLIAM C		
SUITE 220				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MONTERE	MONTEREY, CA 93940				

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
3 4.	10/014,823	DE JONG ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	William C. Vaughn, Jr.	2143
The MAILING DATE of this communication riod for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 (after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicat - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TON. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rion. s, a reply within the statutory minimum of third period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON ristatute, cause the application to become AB	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
atus		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice units application.	This action is non-final. Ilowance except for formal matt	
sposition of Claims		
4)	thdrawn from consideration.	
pplication Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exact 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the county The oath or declaration is objected to by the specific	accepted or b) objected to lot on the drawing(s) be held in abeyant correction is required if the drawing	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
iority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International B	ments have been received. ments have been received in A e priority documents have been	pplication No

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date _

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)

6) Other: ____.

Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)



Application/Control Number: 10/014,823 Page 2

Art Unit: 2143

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in regards to the Amendment and Response received on 22 October 2004.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makower et al. (Makower), U.S. PG Pub 2002/0184507.
- 5. Regarding claim 1, Makower discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Makower discloses a method for enhanced quality of identification in a data communication network [see Makower, abstract], the method comprising: obtaining a user identifier, said user identifier comprising an identification server, said identification server ID identifying an identification server peer group comprising at least one server that maintains a mapping between an identification randomized ID (Makower teaches a federation of servers that each server has an associated identifier, that uniquely distinguishes it from all other server), [see Makower, section 0023 and 0028] and an identification randomized ID (Makower teaches that when data is received at the web server from the client, the web server creates a unique, random string called

Art Unit: 2143

a challenge), [see Makower, section 0028]; and a mapping between said identification randomized ID and user information [see Makower, section 0028] requesting authorization of said user by presenting said user identifier to a corresponding [see Makower, section 0023], configured to search for one or more matching entries [see Makower, section 0023-0035]. However, Makower does not explicitly disclose a user authentication peer group. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made for Makower to have allowed for the federation servers to have the capability to not only be a part of the identification server peer group but to also provide for the ability to be a part of the user authentication group that also authenticates and since, Makower does teach mapping as well as authentication done by the federation of web servers which also includes a server id as well as a random ID. By this rationale claim 1 is rejected.

- 6. Claim 2 list all the same elements of claim 1, but in program storage device form rather than method form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 2.
- 7. Claim 3 list all the same elements of claim 1, but in apparatus form rather than method form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection of claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 3.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William C. Vaughn, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3922. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-6:00, 1st and 2nd Friday Off.

Application/Control Number: 10/014,823

Art Unit: 2143

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

William C. Vaughn Jr. Primary Examiner

Page 4

Art Unit 2143

WCV